

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ROBERT C. BONJORNI, *et al.*,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,  
Defendant.)

Case No. C11-1841RSL

## ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

On April 2, 2012, plaintiffs filed a “Motion for Court to Reconsider Order of Dismissal and Motion for Leave to Supplement and Amend Complaint” in the above-captioned matter. Dkt. # 22. Motions for reconsideration must be filed within fourteen days of the date of the Order at issue and, even when timely filed, are disfavored in this district. Local Civil Rule 7(h). Plaintiffs offer no explanation for their tardy filing. The motion for reconsideration is therefore denied as untimely.

Nor have plaintiffs shown “manifest error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier without reasonable diligence.” Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Plaintiffs argue that a consent decree to which defendant is a party may be relevant to this case, but make no attempt to explain its relevance, to provide a proposed amended pleading, or to otherwise show that reconsideration and/or amendment would be anything but futile.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ claims were dismissed for a number of

<sup>1</sup> Instead, plaintiffs make sweeping statements that convey no actual information, such as providing a summary of mortgage litigation around the country “to present some of the issues that are ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

1 reasons, and none of them could be cured by amendment.

2

3 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration and/or  
4 amendment is DENIED.

5 Dated this 4th day of April, 2012.  
6

7   
8

9 Robert S. Lasnik  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

part of the issues that will be part of the recently discovered information we pray the Court will allow in  
the requested supplemental pleading." Dkt. # 22 at 4.